REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 11, and 12 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 are amended herein. Claim 8 is cancelled and new Claim 12 is added.

The May 1 Office Action.

In the current Office Action, dated May 1, 2007, it is noted with appreciation that the Examiner withdrew all previous prior art rejections and the previsou Section 112 rejections. The Examiner did however issue a new prior art rejection alleging the Claims 1 – 3 and 8 are obvious over the Schultz reference. Claim 4 – 7 and 11 are understood to include allowable subject, but are objected to as depending from rejected Claim 1.

II. The July 23 Office Action.

On July 23, 2007, a telephone interview was held between Examiner Robinson and John Thallemer, an attorney of record in this case. During this interview, the patentability of the claims vis-à-vis the Schultz reference was discussed as well as certain clerical amendments to improve the readability of the claims and the better clarify the scope of the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Based upon this discussion with the Examiner, Claims 1, 2, 9, and 11 are amended herein in a manner which the Examiner indicated would be allowable over the art currently of record, including the Schultz reference. It is Applicants' understanding that in light of these amendments, the Examiner will withdraw the obviousness rejections of Claims 1 – 3 and 8 and will subsequently issue a new, non-final Action on the merits. A new and favorable Action is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed. Applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper be charged to our Deposit Account No. 12-2355.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:

Registration No. 47,601

Date: October 30, 2007

Application No. 10/521,294 October 30, 2007

P.O. Box 1871 Knoxville, Tennessee 37901 (865) 546-4305